by those who have undertaken to announce his purposes in the debate which has taken place on this resolution. Kossuth himself can better explain what he means by these propositions than any one else, and as he has had no chance of speaking to-day for himself, I propose to af-ford him an opportunity. When Kossuth shall have spo-ken it will be a fit time to close this debate; and I trust that the little speech which I send to the Clerk to read, from the great Hungarian himself, explanatory of his plat-form, will be the last made upon the subject. The following extract from Kossuth's address to the Jackson Democratic Association was then read:

"My nation believes that the United States, presenting themselves before the world in that imposing attithemserves before the world in that imposing attitude, will restrain tyrants without any war. Let me say that I came not to try to engage your arms and the blood of your hearts to fight our battles. We will fight our battles ourselves. [Applause.] I came not to entangle you in a war. We can fight our own battles. We are a nation capable of achieving our own freedom if we have fair play. If a nation like Hungary, with fifteen willings of inhabitance is not oble to find the weather. teen millions of inhabitants, is not able to fight its own bat-tles, by its own force, against its own enemy—if it is not strong enough to settle its own domestic matters by its own strength, it deserves not, it merits not, to be free. All we want is fair play. [Applause.] We do not wish to fight against the whole world. The only thing which we desire is fair play."

Mr. BAYLY, of Virginia. I will remark that the extract which has just been read does not contain all that Kossuth has said on that point. [Prolonged laughter.] I hope that laugh will not be taken out of my time. He has told us, with that candor which newed laughter.] He has told us, with that candor which has characterized him since he came amongst us, that when he asks us to declare against intervention, if that declaration of ours was disregarded upon the part of Rus-That sia, that he expected us to go to war to sustain it. is what he said, and it cannot be disputed on the floor; and an attempt ought not to be made to disguise it. Now, I want to put to the American Congress one or two simple inquiries in respect to this doctrine in favor of non-intervention. I ask what department can commit us to it in a form to be authoritative and respected? Suppose the Executive should declare it, does not every one know that, coming from that Department alone, it would be brutum fulmen? Suppose it should not be respected, as it most probably would not be, what could the President do? He could not back it with the army and navy of the United States. The war-power resides in Congress; and no appropriation to that use can be made for a longer period than two years. All he could do would be to conwene Congress, and recommend to it to declare war to make good his declaration. Congress is, as we all know, a fluctuating body; an opposition Congress is not always disposed to carry out Executive recommendations, and it cannot be relied upon with certainty that all future Con gresses would go to war to sustain such a declaration even if made by a President to whom it was friendly. I certainly would not do it in a case which did not strong! enlist its sympathy. Yet to cause the principle to be respected in any case, it would be necessary to vindicate it in all. I repeat, what Kossuth himself admits in effect, that, unless it is known by other nations that we would vindicate our declaration by war if it was not respected, it would be mere brutum fullmen.
Suppose the declaration made by the Executive and by

Kossuth's doctrines are impracticable under our form of Government. Let me illustrate. Suppose this Government was to commit itself in all of its branches to them; suppose about August Hungary should again strike for her independence; suppose Russia should interfere, as interfere she would, for the right to do so, as she esteems, is the vital principle of her system, and she would risk a war with us or any body else sooner than surrender it, all the President could do would be to convene Congress. This would take sixty days. We would debate at least six weeks, more likely six months, before a declaration of war would be made. Then we would have to take time to raise and discipline an army, unless we do what I think is an indispensable adjunct to this policy, keep on hand a large standing army. Then they are to be trans-ported to Hungary, and in the mean time she is again prostrate; and we, I suppose, would either return our fingers in our mouths or wage a war to resuscitate her. In other words, we would wage a war to bring into existence a republic rather than to succor one. If we desire to engage in this policy, I think France presents a fair theatre. That is the view I hinted at yesterday; but I did not wish to elaborate it then, and, of course, I do not mean to attempt it now, in the five minutes that are allotted me. I shall do it hereafter. But I undertake to say that this doctrine of intervention is utterly inconsistent with the whole structure of our Government. Under a monarchy it is different. When the King of England or any other of the potentates of Europe make a declaration against intervention, they have all the war-power in their own hands, and they can back their declaration without consulting any body. I undertake to say, with some little knowledge of history upon this subject, that there has been no case where any nation of Europe has taken the decisive stand which we are called upon to take, that did not at least commence making preparation for war co-existent with its declaration. In most cases the prepara-tion has preceded the declaration; and to cause it to be respected this must be done. If we are to adopt this European policy we must adopt all essential parts of it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

it was not agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON offered the following amounts of the state of the amendment of Mr. CHURCHWELL: Resolved, That the Speaker be requested to appoint a committee who shall report to this House whether, in their opinion, the resolution of the last Congress inviting Father Mathew to

a seat in this Hall committed members of Congress and the Government of the United States to the cause of temperance. [Great laughter.] The CHAIRMAN ruled the amendment out of order.

Mr. YATES offered the following amendment to the

"And that said committee be instructed to inform Louis Kossuth that the Government of the United States will not nossuth that the Government of the United States will not look with indifference on the intervention of Russia, or any other foreign Power, against Hungary, in any struggle for liberty she may hereafter have against the despotic power of Austria."

Mr. YATES said: I have introduced this amendment only for the purpose of saying that I am in favor of the original resolution. I am astonished that gentlemen will not permit the House to come to a fair vote upon that resolution. The resolution does not commit the House to the principle of intervention. No, sir; not even by implication or construction. There is nothing in it which, ac cording to a fair and honest interpretation, can be con-strued a committal to that principle. The only question is, whether we will extend a cordial welcome to this illus trious champion of human rights? It contains a simple direction to the committee to wait upon Louis Kossuth and to introduce him to this House. When gentlemen array the objection of intervention against this resolution, they travel out of the record. There is no such averment in the declaration. It is a simple act of courtesy, and no more. I would not, sir, heedlessly involve this nation in the affairs of foreign nations. I see no reason yet to change the time-honored policy of the country-entangling alliances with none; and immediate intervention, by means and men, might prove most disastrous to the best interests of our country, and might even endangerits existence, to say nothing of the blood to be shed, and the immense amount of treasure to be expended, in much case of the blood to be expended, in much case of the blood to be shed, and the immense amount in any way to involve my country in of treasure to be expended, in such a fanciful crusade for

But, sir, I would be willing to go further even than this resolution, and to express, in unequivocal terms, our sympathy for every nation struggling against power and des-

potism for true and genuine liberty.

Who is Louis Kossuth? He stands forth prominent be fore the civilized world as the distinguished representative of the democratic principle in Europe; as one who, in the council chamber of his native land—in the Hungarian Diet—contended for the abolition of feudal prerogatives, for the principle of popular representation, and for unre-stricted equality without regard to rank or birth, and who is now the great missionary of freedom, and is setting on fire the whole civilized world by the splendor and power and brilliancy of his eloquence in the sacred cause of oppressed humanity. He comes here an exile. Overcome by his enemies, defeated by the treachery of his friends, incarcerated in Austrian dungeons, banished from his native country, from the home of his childhood, yet his lofty spirit, still unbroken, towers with the great idea of re-demption to Hungary, and his great heart still beats with the unfaltering purpose to strike for freedom and the rights of man. This, sir, is the man whom we propose to

Sir, if it be intervention, which I deny, to shake by the hand this republican, then I am for intervention. If it be intervention to proclaim our sympathy for any people struggling for disenthralment from tyranny, for the great principles of democratic liberty, then I am for it. [Several voices: "That's right."] If it be intervention for this Congress to express its indignant condemnation of the tyranny of Austria and the double tyranny of Russia, in the progress of this Hungarian. progress of this Hungarian war, then I am for it. [Voices: "That's right."] Sir, the inglorious sentimen that we, the freest nation in the world, enjoying all the blessings of republican government, can be the struggles of the oppressed for the same liberty we possess, is a sentiment unworthy of the spirit of the age in which we live, and should find no lodgment in the Ame-It has been the policy of this Government.to express its sympathy in such cases, and I hope it will continue to be. We must do right, sir, let the consequences be what they may. If Russia and Austria take offence and bring on war, it will be their war and not ours. We shall fight in the defence; and in a righteous war upon our own soil we could bid defiance to the despotisms of the world. Bright glories have covered our arms in three wars already; but in this last and final struggle between freedom and despotism, our good old flag would be borne aloft in triumph, the glorious ensign of liberty to the world.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that there is no precedent for this welcome. I am willing to admit that precedent is worth something, and could show that we had precedents in a good measure similar to the case now before us in the reception of Lafayette and Father Mathew; but what is it for which gentlemen ask a precedent? Why, sir, it is this: we must not take a good republican by the hand because we have no precedent for it. This, sir, with due deference to gentlemen, I must say is simply ridicu-lous. No precedent, sir! I will inquire if all advance in This, sir, legislation, all progress in civil or political reform, and even the friendly exchange of the common courtesies of life are to be disregarded, because there is no precedent for them? Sir, it is in politics as it is in the physical sciences, in improvements in agriculture or the mechanic arts; it is an age of progress, in which in some things we are leaving the old landmarks behind and striking out a new path. Less than half a century ago and there was no precedent for steamboats, or railroads, or telegraphs. Now, sir, we have precedents in the palaces that float upon the bosoms of our rivers and plough the ocean; in the iron horse that thunders along our mountains and valleys; and in the long wires which bear our thoughts and messages faster than eagles fly. Sir, if there is no precedent in the annals of Congress for tendering the hospitalities of this nation to so distinguished a champion of human rights as Louis Kossuth, then the sooner we have such a

precedent the better. The more is the honor to us if we shall be the first Congress to set such a glorious precedent. But Kossuth is a foreigner. This, sir, is no objection with me. It is justly our boast that ours is an asylum for the oppressed of every clime; and long, long I hope it will continue to be. When the lone exile of oppression shall find no other refuge, here, sir, in all time to come, may he find a foothold. A considerable portion of the pomay he find a foothold. pulation of the district I have the honor to represent consists of Germans, and, sir, they are distinguished for their intelligence, enterprise, and public spirit; but, more than this, they are distinguished for their ardent devotion to our Government. They readily learn our language, take an interest in our schools and public works, and I believe, sir, are as sober, industrious, moral, and patriotic as our native American citizens. Upon the great subject of liberty I humbly trust that this House cannot hesitate because Kossuth is a foreigner. The true friends of free-dom are united in the bonds of brotherhood throughout the world, and no natural barriers, no differences of lo cality, of clime, or country, no ocean running between should divide them.

Mr. Chairman, this is a noble opportunity for the re-

presentatives of this great nation to testify to the world their sympathy for a nation struggling to be free. It should not pass. We should give to Kossuth such a wel-come as is worthy of his exalted worth; of his privations in the cause of freedom; of his illustrious services, and of him as one of the greatest living orators of the age; and such a welcome as is worthy of this great nation. Ours is the greatest and freest nation on the earth. We have attained to a fuller and more perfect development of the democratic principle than any other people. Then, sir, let us welcome Kossuth in a manner worthy of this our great land of free States and spreading millions of free people. Let no idle and inglorious fears of offending the despots of Europe deter us from the plain dictates of ps triotic duty. Let Kossuth feel that the simple, unosten Congress also, it could only bind the Congress that would tations welcome of this House is a full reward for all his services in behalf of oppressed humanity; and that this land, with institutions based emphatically upon the power of the people, is indeed an asylum for the Let him feel that if he does not get men and money and armed intervention from our Government, he gets what is not less potent for his cause—the moral power of this

Mr. Chairman, let not the representatives of the people be behind the people themselves. I rejoice, sir, that, standing in the Capitol of my country for the first time, it is my prerogative to speak for this resolution. Let us hail Kossuth, not for himself only, but for his cause, as the elder Adams said of the Fourth of July, "with gratulation and joy, with bonfires and illuminations." Welcome should be inscribed upon the doors of the Capitol, upon the flag that floats above us-

[Here the hammer fell.] Mr. GREY said that this debate had taken a range and latitude which to him seemed strange and inappropriate. The simple question presented by the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARTTER) was as to the appointment of a committee to introduce Mr. Kossuth t the House of Representatives. Yet a person entering the hall, and ignorant of the true question before the House, would suppose that the proposition under discussion was war with Russia and direct intervention in the contest between Hungary and Austria. The resolution presents no such issue. The question is simply whether we shall now repudiate, or carry out the invitation heretofore tendered to Kossuth: whether we shall extend to him the cour tisies to which we stand committed by the action of the Executive and by past legislation? In February last the Secretary of State, the officer charged with the management of our foreign relations, had taken the initiative, and instructed our Minister in Turkey to open negotiations with the Turkish Government for the liberation of Kossuth. This proceeding of the National Executive had been subsequently endorsed and approved by Congress by the resolution of March last instructing the Danish to send a national vessel to bring Kossuth to this country.
The President in his message informed Congress that Here the hammer felt.]
The question was then upon Mr. STANTON'S amendment to the amendment of Mr. Churchwell, and he had complied with their instructions, and that Kossuth was soon expected to arrive, and he referred to their conquestion of the manner of the recept

and treatment of this distinguished man, thus brought to this country by the order of Congress. Kossuth arrived, and the President of the United States, as commanderin-chief of the army and navy, had received him at New York as the nation's guest with a national salute. gress then adopted the following joint resolution:

Resolved, &c. That the Congress of the United States, the name and behalf of the people of the United States, give to Louis Kossuth a cordial welcome to the capital and to the country; and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to him by the President of the United States.

Where did this demonstration in favor of Kossuth ori-It was not a Democratic measure, nor a Whig measure; but a measure of the National Executivethe Secretary of State, who controls the foreign affairs of and who first suggested that we should pass the country, a joint resolution welcoming Louis Kossuth to the capital

In compliance with the invitation tendered him by Cor gress in this joint resolution. Kossuth presents himself in this capital. Now, the plain question is, Will you recall or will you fulfil the invitation you have given him? Are you now doubtful of his worth and merits? not the same data by which to judge of his worth and merits before you gave him this invitation as now? My colleague on my right (Mr. Ewing) fears that this tends to intervention in the affairs of Europe, and asks where are we to stop? I answer, that the question of intervention or non-intervention is not before us. It will be time enough to decide that question when it arises. The question now presented, and the only question, is, shall we fulfil the reasonable expectations created by our own preinvited Kossuth to come to the vious action? Having capital, shall we receive him and treat him with courtesy, now that he has accepted our invitation? And shall we by so doing, express our sympathy for the progress o gation of the doctrines advocated by Kossuth. Yet I see no reason why we should not give him and his cause the moral influence of our countenance and sympathy, by receiving him with the civility and politeness due to our own self-respect. The law of nations does not forbid the exercise of such hospitality, nor the expression of our sympathies for this distinguished man and the cause he represents. The despotic Powers of the world combine to maintain and uphold their doctrines, and why should we hesitate to give the moral influence of our sympathy to liberal and republican institutions, or to extend to their representative the civilities to which we are committed? To my colleagues, who differ from me on this question, I say that the people of Kentucky would not hesitate to do so, fully, frankly, heartily, and gracefully, as the occasion demands.

Sir, Louis Kossuth, as the great apostle of liberty, as

the representative of those who advocate liberal princi-ples in Europe, as a martyr to those principles, and an exile from his own dear Hungary, would be greeted nowhere with a more cordial and whole-souled welcome than in Kentucky. To my colleagues who oppose this resolution (Messrs. Masshall and Ewing) I will suppose this case: They unite in an invitation to a distinguished but unfortunate individual, a citizen of another State of this Union, or, if they please, of a foreign Government, to come and make his home in Kentucky. They send their "coach and four" to bring him to the State. He arrives. They again unite in a joint note, bidding him welcome to the State, and to their houses. He so conducts himself that he is received in every town and city with the greatest enthusiasm, with every token of the highest appreciation, and he is escorted by committees from town to town, till he reaches the doors of my two colleagues. Would they then say to their families and friends, "Sit still, be quiet, don't move; I won't invite this man in, nor intro duce him to my household, for fear he may next ask for a loan of money, or some new favor; or lest he may not behave like a gentleman, and act in all respects with pro-priety." Is this Kentucky hospitality? No, sir, no. After such invitations and antecedents, a Kentuckian would meet the stranger at the door; would do it hand-somely; would take him cordially by the hand and ex-"Welcome, sir, thrice welcome to these halls. Allow me the pleasure of introducing you to my family and This much is due from this House to the distinguished patriot and exile who now stands at our doorour own invited guest. The resolution of the gentleman from Ohio does this, and commits us to nothing more; and I will vote for it with all my heart.

But it is said that if you receive him, as this resolution

with that hospitality and those civilities which seem called for by the invitation which has brought him here. If you invite a man to your house, you receive him when he comes with cordial courtesy; and if he afterwards prents an unreasonable request, or one which you do not think proper to concede, you may then with better grace It has been imputed as an offence to Kossuth that he

has appealed from the Government to the people. I do not so understand him. In contrasting the Governments of Europe with that of the United States—a contrast drawn from him by the excitement of the warm reception with which his landing in America was greeted by the people— he has said that here the people are sovereign, as they should be, and as he wishes to see them in his own coun-try. In declaring that the people are the true sovereigns, I understand him as declaring his assent to that principle of our Government which he wishes to see introduced into his own country. Has not every member of this nto his own country. Has not every member of this House, in his canvassing, used the same language, and in the same spirit, when addressing the people? If so, did they mean any offence to the people or to the Government? If not, why take exception to the same language when spoken by Kossuth? For my part, being well convinced that he intended no offence, I will not captiously take offence. It is also urged that we offered him an asylum; hat we invited him to become a resident amongst us; and that we ought not to receive him because he co eside, but as a transient visiter. But if you invite a person to take up his abode with you, and he comes to thank you, will you turn your back upon him because he respectfully makes known that his circumstances prevent his accepting your kind offer? We do not do so in Kentucky. No, sir. Congress invited Kossuth to come to America. On his arrival, the President received him as the nation's On his arrival, the President received him as the nation's guest, with a national salute. Congress has since invited him to the capital; and since he has come on that invitation, I, for my part, will receive him in the manner which I think our previous action requires—with the cordial sympathy due to his cause, with the honors due to him as sympathy due to his cause, with the nonors and to his sympathy due to his cause, with the polite courtesy and generous hospitality for which the American people are discourse more than the people of the State

which I have the honor in part to represent.

The Committee then finding itself without a quorum, ose and reported that fact to the House, which soon after FRIDAY, JANUARY 2, 1852.

The same subject was again under consideration. Mr. Venable had moved the following as a substitute for Mr. "That the Speaker be authorized to invite Louis Kossuth to privileged seat within the House.

Mr. Chunchwell had moved to amend the original reolution by adding thereto the following, viz: "Provided, That by the adoption of the above resolution a impliment is only intended to the distinguished Hungarian." Mr. WASHBURN moved to amend the amendment of

Mr. WASHBURN moved to amend following: "Provided, That nothing in this resolution shall be con-strued as impairing the effect or questioning the policy of the measures passed by the last Congress known as the compro-

The CHAIR ruled the amendment out of order. Mr. WASHBURN. 1 move, then, to amend the amend-ment by striking out the word "only." The resolution of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARTTER) is but a comliment, and it seems to me that it is a natural and ap ropriate sequence of the joint resolution which passed a few days ago by the nearly unanimous voice of both Houses of Congress. The opposition which this resolu-tion meets with seems to me a very strange thing. What does this resolution imply? What is it? It implies just what it expresses—nothing more and nothing less. It says that inasmuch as this distinguished stranger has been nvited to the capital, and is now at our gates, it is proper and fitting for us to provide for his introduction and re-ception here, in a manner worthy of ourselves and worthy It cautiously and studiously ignores the quesion of intervention or non-intervention, and all other questions. And if it is strange that such a resolution should meet with opposition, it is still stranger to me that t should meet with the kind of opposition which it has ountered here. Gentlemen are not only unwilling to pass the resolution, but it seems as if they felt themselves nder an obligation to insult the distinguished stranger, and wound the cause that they profess to have at hea Not content with opposing the resolution in a fair, legiti-mate, and straightforward way, they have resorted to every species of obstruction and strategy to prevent us from coming to a vote on the resolution. And for what? Simply to stifle the expression of the feeling of the people of this country in favor of Kossuth and his cause. It would have been infinitely better that no resolution had been introduced here, than that we should have made such a record as will be made—a record that will stand as long as this Government shall last a record that cannot be blotted out or burnt out.

Gentlemen have endeavored to alter this resolution.

They have stood here and chaffered and bartered as to the amount of courtesy that is to be shown to this distinguished republican. They have tried how small a modic ourtesy they could get extended to him. Allusion has been made to other distinguished individuals who have been invited into this hall. Rut there has been no case at all parallel to this. Kossuth is here by invitation of Congress. He was brought here, as the President informs us, under the authority of Congress. In an Executive comunication, the President recommends that we shall consider the manner in which this man, brought in by our own authority, shall be received and treated. Besides all this, we ourselves, by a nearly unanimous vote, have in-vited him to come here. He has responded to that invitation, and is now here. I say, then, that we can pass no less resolution than this. This is not like the cases of Father Mathew, Ujhazi, and others. No other individual has been brought to our shores under the authority of Congress, been made the subject of an Executive communication to Congress, or been invited here by joint resolu-tion of both Houses. The circumstances of the case are different, and therefore our action should be different also. submit further, that it is better to let the naked ones tion go to the country than to qualify it. I have voted against all amendments and qualifications, because I will ot have an issue raised before the country independent the question of courtesy. If we adopt any qualification, we raise an issue; on that issue we shall have to go to the country, and it will be said by the people and the press throughout the land that the House of Representaives has as good as said that should there be another conest between Austria and Hungary, Russia may interfere as much as she likes, with our consent. The adoption of a qualification of any kind means something. You cannot add any thing that is unnecessary and out of place without meaning something, and that is the translation that the country will give to it. Now, I say that it is not wise for us to make such an issue. It is better for the peace, quiet, and harmony of the whole country that we should

[Here the hammer fell.] Mr. BARRERE. Coming as I do from a State which is said to be favorable to this resolution, and intending to vote against it, it is right and proper that I should give some of the reasons why I take that course. It is but proper that the friends of the resolution should give us the reasons why it should be passed, and I have had some anxiety to ascertain why it should be passed. One gentleman tells us that it is a mere matter of courtesy; another than the state of the same tells as the s ther, that it is a tribute to the great principles of republi-canism and national independence; a third, that it is to endorse Kossuth's views of intervention; and a fourth tells us that it is because the executive officers of this Governdeference. As to the matter of courtesy, if any blame ataches to the manner of his reception in Washington, it attaches to the Senate's committee, who received him, and not to the Executive officers of the Government or the minority in this House. The President of the United States and the heads of several Executive Departments have received and treated him with marked attention and respect. I do not think that this proceeding can be properly looked on in that light. Gentlemen may get up here much as they like, and say that they do not mean this or that; but the construction that the country, our peo-ple at home, and the world, would put upon this resolu-tion will be that we endorse this man's doctrines.

Now, what principle does he represent? If he represents in these United States any principle at all, it is the principle of intervention for the sake of non-intervention; and further, one which has not been remarked upon in this House, but which I think more objectionable than any other, and that is, that we shall acknowledge the independence of Hungary—a nation that is not now in existence; and also that we shall acknowledge him as Governor of Hungary, when he voluntarily resigned his office to a man whom his friends and admirers in this House charge with ng a traitor to Hungary. . If this man comes here as the representative of any great principle at all, it is of that. Are we to suppose that he preaches one set of doctrines when he intends to represent another? Look at his speeches; if they contain the views and doctrines which he intends our people to understand he came here to represent, then he is the representative of the doctrine of intervention for the sake of non-intervention. I do not blame Kossuth. I undertake to say that I feel as much sympathy for him, and admiration for his talents, for his mius, and for the efforts he made in behalf of his op-ressed country, as any man in this House. I undertake say that no man here feels more for down-trodden humanity, wherever found, than I do. The gentlemen who represent the opponents of this resolution as the apologists of Haynau, or any other tyrant, show little under-

proposes, he will next ask your aid and intervention in the affairs of Hungary. Be it so. Will it be a crime in Kossuth to ask our aid? I think not. He has a right to ask, as we have a right to grant or to withhold, as we may judge fitting and proper, when the demand or request is presented. And I ask how we will be in any worse condition to refuse his request, after we have received him with that how it is the horse triality and those civilities are in favor of this man's doctrine; for I take upon myself to say that the people of the great cities are not so sound upon the political questions of the day as are the yeomanry of the country. We are asked whether we are afraid that Kossuth wants to lead the American people. I subjects, extraneous as I think, which have been brought in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been more to be swerved from my course because the great in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been in session, but I rise simply for the purmittee have been in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been many hours which this committee have been in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been to a subject, extraneous as I think, which have been brought in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been in and discussed during the many hours which this committee have been in and d away from Washington and the policy of Washington. For one, I am not afraid. I do not fear that the American people would be led away from the sacred policy of the country, even though the American Congress should proverecreant to its duty, and vote for all of Kossuth's propositions; for I have no fears that any foreigner, however tions; for I have no fears that any foreigner, however distinguished, whether a whiskered Pandour, or a fierce ar, or any other character, can lead the popular mind of this great country away from its allegiance to its long-cherished and settled policy. The hearts of the American people are still fixed with pride and exultation upon Wash-

gton and his policy. Whilst, therefore, I am willing to extend to Kossuth the hand of friendship; whilst I am willing to do all in my power for down-trodden humani., I am not willing that the American Congress shall commit itself to the appro-bation of a set of doctrines which in my opinion are de-structive of the maxims, views, and principles laid down by the great founders of our Republic.

The question was then taken on Mr. WASHBURN'S amendent to the amendment, and it was not agreed to. Mr. STANTON, of Ohio. I offer the following as an amendment to the original resolution:

"And that the Government and people of the United States
sympathize with the people of Hungary in their struggle for

Being a friend to the original resolution, (said Mr. S.) I had not intended to occupy the time of the committee in discussing it, and I should not have done so had I not differed from my colleague, (Mr. Barrers,) for whom I entertain a very high regard. It is the first time I have ever heard it gravely argued that a simple act of civility, an every set of the comment has ritalities of life committed. ever heard it gravely argued that a simple act of civility, an exercise of the common hospitalities of life, committed a man to the sentiments of his guest. This resolution contemplates a simple act of hospitality. Nay, it is not even that. The two Houses of Congress have cordially welcomed Louis Kossuth to the capital and the country. He is now the nation's invited guest. He stands before it in that position, and it cannot be escaped. This resolution—copied from one passed by the Senate almost without opposition—merely contemplates the formal mode of receiving and entertaining him. It is as though you said, when he reaches your door, "Walk in, and take a seat."

when he reaches your door, "Walk in, and take a seat. That is the whole effect of the resolution. But it is argued that the adoption of this resolution would commit this Congress and the nation to the sentiments of their guest. Sir, I take it to be no such thing. I will not clog this resolution with any thing that is in-consistent with it—with any thing that is equivalent to consistent with it—with any thing that is equivalent to saying that we perform this act of civility reluctantly, grudgingly, and hesitatingly, because that is the same as saying that Kossuth is an unwelcome guest.

Some other things that have taken place in this discus-sion are rather extraordinary to my mind. Even though

gentlemen are not disposed to intervene in favor of Hun-gary or any other country, I cannot see the necessity of avowing it before the time arrives. The only effect of can be to say to the despots of Russia and Austria, "So far as we are concerned, you have our approbation, endorsement, and permission to go on and trample under foot the nations of the European continent." For one, I

will hold out no inducements or encouragement to the despots of Europe to trample down the people there.

But I will do this; I am prepared to express the sympathy of the Government and people of this country in the European struggles for liberty. I am prepared to interfere with every species of intervention short of armed intervention; and whether I will resent to even distance. tervention : and, whether I will resort to armed intervention or not, I will decide when the question shall properly arise. I will say, however, that I can hardly imagine any contingency in which I would vote for a national war, for am opposed to wars of all descriptions; but I am certainly opposed to declaring in advance, and before the

But, sir, as I have already said, the question is not now before us. The question before us is simply one as to the formality in receiving one who is already the nation's ole form that has been adopted by the other branch of the Government; and I shall vote for it, too, as an additional indication of the sympathy which we feel for the down-trodden classes of Europe. Sir, I confess I have been much surprised that, upon a question of this sort, involving no constitutional or political principle, and which commits the House and the nation to no practical action that affects the welfare of the country, revolutionary struggles should have been resorted to, and that a minority should have placed itself in the attitude of a factious endeavor to defeat the passage of the resolution. Now, if such a course is to be pursued upon a question of this sort; if a minority is to rule this body upon an unimportant question, may we not expect the same power to be exercised on every occasion, and is not the right of the majority to govern in this House effectually stricken down?

[Here the hammer fell.] Mr. MILLSON. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I ar somewhat impatient of this protracted discussion, and I should be entirely satisfied if the committee would come at once to a vote upon the propositions pending before it.

I, for one, have not engaged in any scheme, as gentlemen order of the House shall be rescinded or changed without out one day's notice thereof."

No such notice was given with the 136th rule also declares that "no standing rule or over the country.

Out one day's notice thereof."

Your opposition excites it, and gives it great weight the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. CART-TER.) I have voted upon every division, and therefore the censures of which gentlemen have been so lavish are not applicable to me. The committee seem determined to adopt some one of the complimentary resolutions under consideration, and I see no good that can result from mere delay; not that I am at all in favor of the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio. On the contrary, I am warmly and decidedly opposed to it, though not altogether for the reasons that have been urged by those who have preceded me in the debate. The adoption of this resolution will not necessarily commit us to interven-tion in the affairs of Hungary, though there is a significance in the declarations of Kossuth, and in the remarks of several gentlemen upon this floor, which make it dangerous to overlook the objections entirely. Nor do I see, as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Stanly) seems to suppose, that there is any necessary comexion between the question of slavery and a public reception of Kossuth. And I am sure, Mr. Chairman, I need not say that my objection to the resolution proceeds in no degree from an unwillingness to bestow upon the distinguished Hungarian any civilities which it might become us to offer. I oppose it as a mere matter of good taste. I do not think it becomes an American Congress to bestow these honors upon any man. I supposed, when Kossuth arrived upon our shores, that he would receive those civilities—even those exaggerated honors which our people are sometimes so ready to offer. To all this there could be no serious objection. He and they, in their character of private citizens, stand upon a footing of equality. But, sir, the people of the United States, in their public, corporate, sovereign capacities, ought not to bow down before any created intelligence. I am unwilling that the representatives of thirty-one sovereignties should dance attendance upon any mortal now living. I object, then, to this resolution. I object to it in substance and in phra-seology. I will not consent that a committee of five genseeingy. I will not consent that a committee of five gen-tlemen of this House, representing as it does the sover-eignty of thirty-one States, should wait upon—yes, that is the phrase—should "wait upon Louis Kossuth." It implies subserviency. It seems to exact the customary service rendered by an inferior to his superior. It is true that in the view in which I am presenting this subject, it is a mere question of dignity; but in national affairs ques-tions of dignity are matters of importance. Junius has "the feather that adorns the royal bird sup-

ports his flight." But, sir, is it one of the functions of an Ame gress to bestow honors upon men; and is it altogether consistent with the genius of a republican Government to do so? It seems to me, sir, to be eminently anti-republican. These things belong to monarchies, but they are out of place here. The President Montesquieu understood this principle very well when he said that honor was the chief spring of monarchical Governments. The framers of our constitution understood it very well, when they denied to Congress the power to grant titles of nobility. But you seek to confer honors, mere honors, when, as it seems to me, the very spirit of our institutions forbid it. But some gentlemen have said that these honors are offered to Kossuth as the representative of a great principle. Sir, what man can claim to be the representative of a great principle? Political equality is of the very essence of our institutions; and no man, whatever may be his advantages of fortune, station, or intellect, can claim to be the representative of a principle, which beongs to the whole community. But, sir, are honors ever bestowed for other reasons than those now urged by the friends of this resolution? It is always to the representative of some principle, so to speak, that they are offered, when they are conferred at all. They are not given to mere flesh and blood, but to rank, and wit, and piety, and to literary merit, or military genius. These are some of the principles represented by those upon whom the favor of the monarch may be lavished. But it is not so with us. Our republican theory is, that the agents of the

The question was then taken, and the amendment to the ent was rejected. Mr. STUART. I move to amend the amendment by inserting the word "high" in the amendment immediately

ore the word "compliment." Mr. S. said: As my amendment indicates, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the resolution nor the many

gument and in reply to the many propositions which have been submitted as amendments to this resolution, and also in reply to many arguments which have been advanced, but I repeat that it is not my purpose to do so. I rise merely for the purpose of saying to those who favor the adoption of the resolution, and those who oppose it, Let adoption of the resolution, and those who oppose it, Let us, as becomes the representatives of thirty-one American States, proceed to definitive action upon this subject, and proceed at once. I hold myself ready to vote for any form of words that suits any gentleman or any number of gentlemen upon this floor, provided those words are respectful in their character, and do not carry with them, either expressly or impliedly, a committal of the Government to the course of Kossuth since he arrived upon our shores. I offer these words for the purpose of pacification. Let us meet upon some common ground, that is objectionable to none of us, with which we can all comply, and let us adopt it. But do not—I ask it of the friends of the resolution—insist so strenuously upon any particular form resolution—insist so strenuously upon any particular form of words as to make us become factious in the eyes of our opponents. And I ask of our opponents that they will not show themselves so punctilious as to insist upon incorporating into this resolution—a mere matter of hospitality—any thing which is offensive. Do not say to this distinguished man what you would dislike yourselves to say to any man who was approaching your domicil, am happy to meet you and welcome you to my home, but I despise your polities, I condemn your religion, and I have but a very slight opinion of your morality; " for, sir, Louis Kossuth might say, in reference to such compliments as this, "Good Lord deliver us." Now, I say, and it is all I rose to say, I beseech gentlemen upon both sides of the House to stop this debate; let us agree upon some form of words, something that is acceptable to all, and let us adopt it, and put ourselves right before the country and before the civilized world.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia. Compliments! the gen Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia. Compliments: the gentleman says. If we do not pass this resolution, unaccompanied with any provise, Mr. Kossuth may say, "Good Lord deliver me from such compliments." Now, sir, I understand that this gentleman, Mr. Kossuth, says that he does not want your compliments. He has not come here to receive compliments. His mission is of quite a different character. He has distinctly made it known. He wants you to change the policy of your Government. This is the issue he made in New York; the same he presented again in Philadelphia; and still again repeated in Baltimore. And why should we pay a compliment to any man who says in advance that he will not thank you for it—that he for higher and more substantial things than empty, unmeaning ceremonies? Do we, or shall we, maintain our own self-respect in tendering compliments under such circumstances? Gentlemen may look upon it as they please, but I cannot, for myself, consider the passage of the resolution in any other light than an endorsement, to some extent, of the principle which he advocates. Any unusual mark of esteem to any man engaged in any great work or enterprise, it seems to me, cannot be looked upon but as expressing, in some degree, an approbation of the cause advocated by the recipient of such distinguished

tokens of respect.

But this, sir, goes to the merits of the resolution and the propriety of its passage. I did not rise to discuss that now. My object is to repel the charge that the minority, in their action against the majority in this matter, are pursuing a factious course. I belong to that minority, and I am prepared to defend their course against any such charge either in this hall or out of it. upon the right; and in this position I intend, as one of them, to stand in perfect defiance of both in-door and out-door clamor. If there be a faction here it is the majority, who are endeavoring to carry their views in open violation of the rules of this House. I stand by these rules, and in standing by them I stand by law and order. Who is it that is disorganizing this body? How was this resolution brought in here, and how is it attempted to be passed through? Stand up, gentlemen, and defend yourselves if you can; if not, cease to talk about faction. How did this resolution get here ? Last Monday a week, when it was perfectly in order, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CART-TER) moved to suspend the rules, that he might be enabled to offer it. It required two-thirds of the House to suspend the rules. There were less than two-thirds who voted for his motion. That method failing, he came into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and offered it here, contrary to all usage, precedent, and parliamentary law, as well as in direct violation of two express rules of this House. Never before was it proposed, in any parliamentary body that I ever heard of, that the Committee of the Whole, who are only empowered to act upon such matters as are referred to them by the House, could originate and bring forth matter that had not been so referred. Yet the gentleman did this, and the majority sustained him in it by simple numerical force, in overruling the decision of the Chair. But this is not all, sir. The 17th rule of

or pretended to be given, and yet the efforts of the majority are to carry this measure by trampling these rules under their feet. They attempted to carry their object by overriding the rules of their organization. Who, then, are the disorganizers? They desire to have a committee appointed to introduce into this hall Louis Kossuth, and this cannot be done but by "rescinding," or "changing," or violating the 136th rule. Their object is to violate that rule, and to do this by numerical strength and the clamor of faction, which clamor is usually resorted to by those who are claiming the exercise of illegal and unjust

Now, sir, I say that these rules, made and adonted in pursuance of the constitution for the government of the roceedings of the House, are the law of the House. And ho are greater disorganizers than those who strike at the very foundation of their own organization? The gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Millson,) to whose speech I listened in the main with a good deal of pleasure, dropped one word or uttered one sentiment that I cannot let pass, and which I regretted to hear him express. He said, while he was opposed to the passage of the resolution, yet finding that it was the manifest wish of the majority that it should pass, that he felt inclined to acquiesce Now, sir, I will at all times defer to the will of the majority, when legally and constitutionally expressed, but never will I yield to the dictation of a majority, who attempt to force upon me any measure in violation of law. Some gentlemen talk as if a majority had the right to have their way upon all questions, and that it was a duty to yield to the known will of the majority. Sir, I deny e doctrine toto cælo, and I will oppose the will of a majority on this floor, and every where, when that will does not conform to law, as unyieldingly as I would oppose any other outrage upon my rights.

Sir, I war against usurpation, let it be begun by many or few, by a majority of this House, or by one man. What is usurpation, Mr. Chairman? It is the exercise of powers that do not belong to those who claim the right to enforce them, whether it be by many or a few-whether it be by a majority of this House or one man—there is no difference. And I shall war against the attempted usurpation of the majority here this day, with the same spirit that I would war against the usurpation of Louis Napo-leon if I were in France; and the craven heart that would asely yield to your illegal declaration, barely because you are in the majority, would be a fit subject to bow his neck to his imperial edicts! And I will resist you as quick as I would him. I would as soon have one master as many. I tell gentlemen, then, plainly, that they may cry factious opposition as loud and as long as they please. For one, I intend to stand by the rights of the minority in this House under the rules. I should feel that I was an unfit representative of the rights of a free people, if I should on this occasion prove recreant in the defence of my own. This is the position I occupy, and I shall hold it, and maintain it, if I can get a little band to stand by me, much longer than Louis Kossuth ever defended the liberties "of his fatherland." You shall never pass this resolution in this way if I can prevent it.

When this resolution was first brought forward on Mon-day week last, I gave a silent vote in my seat against the suspension of the rules to allow its introduction. If two-thirds had voted for it, I should simply have recorded my vote against it. I should not have attempted to thwart vote against it. I should not have attempted to thwart the will of the majority, properly and legally expressed. But I shall not be run over in this way, nor will I sit by and see the rules thus trampled upon for any purpose. If gentleman wish to carry this resolution, which they say there are two to one for, let them cease their present efforts to force the House in this irregular way. Let them bring forward their motion next Monday to suspend the rules, to allow it to be properly considered. If they the rules, to allow it to be properly considered. If they have two to one they can easily pass it. I shall offer no further obstacle than my vote and my reasons, and i there are not two-thirds for it they will have to do as all thers do who fail to succeed in their wishes in bringing people are their servants. Office is not designed to confer personal distinction, but to furnish occasion for rendering public service. The only orders they receive are those they are required to obey.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question was then taken, and the amendment to the minority on this floor. I feel that I and the minority hold. the right in this issue. No one on this floor can or has pretended to answer the argument; and holding this position, I shall continue to hold it and maintain it; I shall

ever surrender it. Upon that you may depend.

The question was taken on the amendment to the amend-

Mr. WALSH moved the following amendment to the " And that the Speaker, in the name of the members of this House, then assure him of their deep gratitude for his signal services in the cause of freedom, and their high respect for his exalted efreracter and genius. Mr. W. said: I have but a very few words to say in support of this amendment. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Brooks) said that this House was putting a mark upon this age. It is, and I am afraid it is going to be a bad mark; I am afraid it is going to be one in reference to which we can utter the ejaculation of "God save the mark!" I therefore want to relieve myself from all connexion with it. Sir, we have fallen upon strange things and strange times. But a short period has elapsed since this distinguished leader, with his associates, were driven from their country, and sought refuge within the limits of Turkey. Christendom then turned her back upon her own champion. The Crescent seemed for a time to as-sume the energies of nature, and to borrow its light from the Sun of Righteousness. You transferred these people then to your own country, and they were received upon your shores with a shout of welcome such as is not often heard within the limits of the Republic, prone as that heart heard within the limits of the Republic, prone as that heart is to generous impulses. Man and matron joined the holy cause; and ministering angels, around your domestic altars, left the scenes of their devoted life, and came forth to bless and hallow the festival of freedom. The sons of toil, with the sweat of their brow turned into gold, came with their offering to his cause. Men, who are accustomed to instruct the wise and hold together the masses, stood confounded by his wisdom, and fascinated by the necromancy of his voice. And where is this distinguished individual to receive, for the first time, the cold shoulder? It is in the councils of the American nation, and the It is in the councils of the American nation! not in the aristocratic Senate, so called, but from the offspring of the masses; so that your future history will read, that of all

masses; so that your future history will read, that of all the people of this great nation, none refused to give him hospitality except those who asked him to come and get it.

I have but little more to say upon this subject; but I ask gentlemen what translation we can give of our votes upon this subject? What translation do we give to the President of France? Gentlemen will recollect that the President of France opposed his coming into that country, and we follow in his footsteps and say that he shall not come into the Capitol. When the record of this proceeding gets to Europe, what will the friends of liberty think of it? I have not time to look into the matter now, or to express my views in connexion with it; but let us look at the effect upon our people. When the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Baylay) said the other day that there were not twenty men in this House who were in favor of intervention, the words were scarcely out of his mouth intervention, the words were scarcely out of intervention, the words were scarcely out of his mouth when the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Disner,) almost the head of his party—a man who was a prominent candidate for the Speakership in the Democratic caucus, and standing in the position he does, whose words are almost the organ of the Democratic party, what does he tell you? He says, never trifle with the people. This man is at your door, and if you do not receive him, if you turn him away from your door, recollect the people will take the matter into their own hands.

Mr. NEWTON said: I do not rise for the purpose of ax-

Mr. NEWTON said: I do not rise for the purpose of explaining or translating the votes I have been giving, and expect to give, upon the resolution. They need no explanation, no translation. My object is to offer some considerations to the committee in favor of the passage of the resolution. What is it? It is a simple proposition to introduce to this House Louis Kossuth by a committee of ourselves. There is no long trail of committal to measures or wishes of our guest, either express or implied. It is a thing for itself, and of itself. It is an introduction to the nation's Capitol, to the nation's Representa-tives; yes, and to the most free and powerful nation on earth, one which boasts of its freedom and free princi-ples. What is a welcome and invitation to visit your house? It is a free-will offering—the frank, open, spon-taneous effusion of the warm hearts of friends to a friend, unjudged and untrammeled. Yea, it is in this connexion more. It is the warm and open heart of the nation to and for the nation's guest and friend, and for the nation and country whose representative he is. And how came he here? Did he come uninvited, unasked, unsought for? No! verily, no! You hunted him up; you dug him up with a national ship. And when and where did you find him, and how? His valor, his skill, and his bleeding country guided the nation's ship to his incarceration, hu-mility, and degradation. And how did you find him? Shut out and shut up from the world, because kings and

Shut out and shut up from the world, because kings and kingdoms feared him. What did you do with him? To use his own eloquent words, you raised him from the dead, and warmed him into life, and permitted him to breathe the free air, inhale free principles, and express free sentiments, and tread the free earth.

You have done more: you have invited him into your palace; and, when he knocks at your door, will you refuse him, vilify him, slander him, and shut the door against him? Who asks you to let him in? Two-thirds of the nation. And yet you repel their earnest wish and desire, and turn them off with scorn and contempt. I ask you to pause and obey your own will that reached him across the ocean, the Chair. But this is not all, sir. The 17th rule of this House, which I hold in my hand, expressly declares that "no person, except members of the Senate, their Secretary, heads of Departments," &c. &c. "shall be admitted into the hall of the House of Representatives."

This is one of the standing rules of this House; and the 186th rule also declares that "no person, except members of the Senate, their so, respect them. Has the nation feeling? If so, respect that. But be cautious how you repel this warm, this generous, and eloquent heart, that swells with the love of liberty and patriotism, and let loose the ulti-

and importance, and it will be difficult to chain and subdue it; and this, too, by your opposition. Retract, therefore-yield, and give up to the voice of the nation, and

grant this simple request.

My friend from Georgia (Mr. Stephens) seems to stand upon technicalities with great tenacity. But does not that gentleman know that the interpretation of these rules is a matter which the House must determine for itself? Mr. STETHENS, of Georgia. Will the gentleman allow me for a moment? When the rules of the House have been adopted they are the law of the House, and can only

be altered or changed through the regular mode. Mr. NEWTON. So I understand. Mr. STEPHENS. Very well; that cannot be done without first giving one day's notice.

Mr. NEWTON. So I understand; but does not the gentleman know that when there is a difference of opinion in

the construction of any rule, that is for the Hou [Here the hammer fell.] Mr. CLARK. I move to amend the amendment by add-

ing the following, viz:

"In the same manner as General Lafayette was introduced to the House of Representatives."

Mr. Clark. Mr. Chairman, I have kept my seat here for two days in silence, while this interesting topic has been under discussion. I have been moved with no ambi-tion to break that silence; but, sir, the door has been tion to break that silence; but, sir, the door has been open wide, and every gentleman who chose to express his sentiments upon this subject has had an opportunity. I take this occasion to say that a large portion of the people whom I have the honor to represent here have, within a few years, emerged from the same condition of depression and wretchedness which attends the people of Hungary, who are now the focus of all the world; and that condition draws upon them not only the observation, but the solici-tude and sympathy of the world. But, sir, were I to keep utter silence, those whom I represent, at least that por tion of my constituents to whom I have alluded, migh think I was recreant to the cause which they hold dear. They might suppose I did not treat their sentiments and feelings with proper respect. I am moved, therefore, to utter a few sentiments upon this resolution, and I regret to see that the question has taken somewhat of a geographical character. Now, sir, I think this condition of things is to be deprecated. I come from the latitude of 42° 30′; and, had I sufficient standing and influence here to make myself a peacemaker, I should hope that the little I may have to say would not be without influence, and

that the humble sentiments I express would not fall to the ground without any effect whatever. I can say to my brethren from the South that they need have no fear of me. There are circles at home, limited, it is true, in which I am regarded as sufficiently a Southern man; and if this be sufficient to regard me a constitutional man, I glory in the estimate put upon me where I live. But, Mr. Chairman, to return to the resolution itself: It seems to me that those gentlemen who have opposed this resolution have opposed it without cause. I speak with great respect of those who have cause. I speak with great respect of those who have opposed the resolution. I refer to the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Stephens,) from Kentucky, (Mr. Marshall,) and the gentleman from North Carolina, (Mr. Stanly;) and I can say most heartily that any thing that should fall from the lips of those gentlemen would be en-titled to great consideration from me. But, Mr. Chair-man, are not their conclusions badly drawn from the proposition? They seem to suppose that if this proposition passes it is an endorsement of the doctrines which have been so zealously and pointedly set forth by the dis-guished Hungarian.

Mr. Chairman, I think these conclusions unwarranted It has often been said that the only purpose of this re-solution is a mere compliment to the distinguished hero

of Hungary.
(Here the Chairman's hammer fell.) (Here the Chairman's hammer fell.)
Mr. Clark. I must say I am taken by surprise.
Mr. BELL. I had no desire to take up the time of the committee by remarks upon this subject; but as it has become fashionable for every member to either offer or oppose some amendment, for the purpose of submitting his views upon the matter at issue, I rise to protest, to some extent, against what I understood to be given as the opinion and feelings of the free and independent citizens of Ohio by one of my colleagues. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Disney,) who spoke on a former day, under the half-hour rule. When he was inquired of to know how far we may go with propriety, as a nation, upon the subject of intervention, he was not, if